



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*ATC*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/522,563 03/10/00 COOK

K 13DV13190

EXAMINER

006111  
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
ANDREW C HESS  
GE AIRCRAFT ENGINES  
ONE NEUMANN WAY M/D H17  
CINCINNATI OH 45215-6301

MM91/1025

PATEL, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2858

DATE MAILED:

10/25/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/522,563

Applicant(s)

COOK ET AL.

Examiner

Paresh Patel

Art Unit

2858

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***1. Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***3. Drawings***

4. The subject matter of this application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR 1.81. No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing.

5. In order to avoid abandonment, the drawing informalities noted in Paper No. 2, mailed on 04/25/2001, must now be corrected. Correction can only be effected in the manner set forth in the above noted paper.

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the comparator and apparatus generating a fault indication signal must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). The drawings are also objected to because they fail to show memory, comparator and one pole lag filter as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Correction is required.

**7. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claims 1-2, 6 and 12, Examiner has following question: 1) what determines a difference between a summed voltage value and a reference value? 2) who generates a fault indicator signal?

Claims 3-5 are rejected because they depend from rejected claims.

Claims 7-11 and 13-14 are rejected because they depend from rejected claim.

Regarding claim 15, Examiner has following questions: 1) what compares an absolute value to a freeze threshold value? 2) what compares an absolute value to a fault threshold value? and what generates a fault indicator signal?

Claims 16-18 are rejected because they depend from rejected claim.

**10. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 6-10 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maher (US 5777468).

Regarding claims 6, 7, 9 and 15, Maher discloses: a transducer including a secondary winding [element 14 and 16 of fig. 3] having at least two voltage outputs [voltage at elements SE1 and SE2 of fig. 3], a short term filter (one pole lag filter) [element R11 and C1 of fig. 3], a first voltage value [+ input to element OP5 of fig. 3], a long term filter (one pole lag filter) [element R12 and C2 of fig. 3], a second voltage value [+ input to element OP6 of fig. 3], a comparator [element OP12 of fig. 3].

Regarding claims 8, 10, 16 and 17, Maher inherently discloses a one pole lag filter has a time constant of .150 seconds and 30 seconds [lines 29-41 of column 4].

**13. Conclusion**

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paresh Patel whose telephone number is 703-306-5859. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 to 4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Paresh Patel  
October 19, 2001



SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800